DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 249 SP 003 022

By-Massialas, Byron C.; And Others

Identification of Social Issues Teachers.

Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-6-1678
Pub Date Feb 69
Contract-OEC-3-7-061678-2942
Note-24p.; Part of a study entitled STRUCTURE AND PROCESS OF INQUIRY INTO SOCIAL ISSUES IN SECONDARY CLASSROOMS.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.30
Descriptors-High School Curriculum, Secondary School Teachers, *Social Problems, Social Values, Teacher Attitudes, Teacher Background, *Teacher Characteristics

A study was conducted to re-examine three generalizations based on limited previous research concerning social issues in schools: (1) Such issues have not been incorporated in the curriculum and are not trained to systematically examine social controversy; and (3) teachers are afraid to examine many social issues because of the possibility of sanctions from the community or school administration. Biology, English, and social studies teachers (493 of the 682 in a probability sample of public and private secondary schools in Michigan) responded to questionnaire items dealing with (1) identification of issues which they considered to be controversial; (2) how much time they devoted to such issues; (3) a fact and opinion matrix (which asked them to differentiate between statements of fact and statements of opinion); (4) issues they felt should or should not be discussed in the classroom and reasons why; (5) types of materials they preferred to use in such discussion; and (6) attitudes toward the roles of teachers and students in the discussion of controversial issues. Demographic data was also collected. A single demographic profile of the "social issues" teacher does not emerge from the data, but the image of the sanction-prone teacher afraid of discussing controversial issues is brought into serious question. (Data summaries for each questionnaire section are presented and discussed. SP 003 023 is a related document.) (JS)

ED032249

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

IDENTIFICATION OF SOCIAL ISSUES TEACHERS

Byron G. Massialas, Jo A. Sweeney, Nancy Freitag

The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to contract OEC3-7-061678-2942 with the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. This paper is part of a study entitled, Structure and Process of Inquiry into Social Issues in Secondary Classrooms.

February, 1969

SP003022

In a democratic society where citizens are required to make judgments regarding various social issues, it is important that individuals be able to identify and analyze value and factual components of alternative positions on social issues. Our schools should encourage young people to critically examine controversial social issues so that they may act constructively in the resolution of social controversy. Unfortunately, though, schools and teachers, at least in the more recent past, apparently have avoided the task of training students to consider alternative ways of resolving social conflict. The limited research concerning social issues in schools suggests that: (a) such issues have not been incorporated in the curriculum and are not purposefully included in classroom materials, (b) teachers are not trained to systematically examine social controversy and (c) teachers are afraid to examine many social issues because of the possibility of sanctions from the community or school administration.

The purpose of this phase of our research is to investigate the above generalizations. Do these generalizations adequately describe the current status of social issues in our schools? Are young people prepared to deal rationally and effectively with social controversy? Are students learning how to support their value positions and to examine critically the grounds upon which they rest? Do teachers capitalize on the stimulation and personal involvement inherent in a discussion of controversial social issues? If the social issues of our time are now discussed in the classroom, how do teachers and students spend their time? These are some of the questions which gave impetus to this phase of the study.

Procedures

The data analyzed in this study were gathered through the use of a questionnaire mailed to a probability sample of secondary schools in Michigan. The biology, English, and social studies teachers in the sampled schools received the questionnaire. It was assumed that because of the nature of the subject matter, these teachers would be more likely to discuss social issues than other teachers. Seventy-three percent or 493 teachers of the 682 teachers in the total sample completed and returned the questionnaire.[1] The teachers were asked

---

[1]The procedure used to select the sample was as follows: The Michigan Education Directory, obtained from Lansing, Michigan, which lists all of the public and private schools in the state, was used to make a list of all schools in the state containing grades 7-12. Schools which included two or more grades in the 7-12 range were included in our sampling frame. For example, schools containing grades 1-7 were not included in our list, but schools containing grades 5-8 were included. Each school in our list was assigned a number. Using a random number table, sixty schools were selected for the first phase in the development of our sample. The principals of the selected schools were contacted by mail and asked to provide a list of all the biology, English, and social studies teachers in their building who taught any of the grades, 7 through 12. This list of teachers composed the second phase of the sampling procedure. Fifty-seven schools, with a total of 682 social studies, English, and biology teachers, agreed to participate.

to respond to items dealing with: (1) identification of issues which they considered to be controversial, (2) how much time they devoted to such issues, (3) a fact and opinion matrix (which asked the teachers to differentiate between statements of fact and statements of opinion), (4) issues they felt should or should not be discussed in the classroom, and (5) the types of materials they preferred to use in such discussion. Also, some items asked the respondents to indicate their attitudes toward the roles of teachers and students in the discussion of controversial social issues. In addition, several demographic items on the teacher were included in the questionnaire.

Where appropriate, scales based on, or drawn from, a combination of items were developed. The type of statistical model applied for the analysis of the data depended on the nature of the data being examined. For nominal data, the chi square model was used to test for significance. For interval data, analysis of variance was used.

DISCUSSION OF SOCIAL ISSUES IN THE CLASSROOM

How much time do teachers spend discussing controversial social issues? Are teachers willing to discuss all social issues or do they avoid some issues? Do the teachers in our sample exhibit concern for sanctioning agents? Are some social issues considered controversial by some teachers, but relatively non-controversial by other teachers?

Issues Discussed and Not Discussed

We know that all people do not identify the same issue as controversial. A topic which is considered highly controversial by one teacher may be considered non-controversial by another. We were interested in knowing whether or not teachers were willing to discuss issues they considered highly controversial.

The teachers in the sample were given a list of topics and asked to identify each as (1) non-controversial, (2) somewhat controversial, or (3) highly controversial. In general, the results indicate that "race relations and integration," "Vietnam," "birth control," and "artificial insemination of human beings" are considered highly controversial issues by most teachers. One of the more interesting findings is that although both "race relations and integration" and "Vietnam" are viewed as highly controversial, they are considered acceptable topics for classroom discussion by the majority of our teachers. "Artificial insemination of human beings" and "birth control," on the other hand, are more often identified as taboo classroom topics.

Past research has suggested that teachers as an occupational group generally avoid discussing any type of controversy in the classroom. A recent investigation of teachers concluded that "the classroom is not looked upon as a medium for the expression of controversial

opinions by teachers."[2] Our data conflict somewhat with this statement. Although many teachers in our sample avoid discussing sexually-related topics in the classroom, the overwhelming majority of the teachers are willing to discuss such controversial issues as "race relations and integration," "Vietnam," and "communist ideology." (See tables V and VII). Evidently, then, the perceived controversial nature of an issue is not necessarily related to its acceptability as a topic for class discussion. Some issues perceived by the teachers as highly controversial are acceptable for class discussion while other highly controversial issues are avoided.

Sanction and Nonsanction Reasons for Not Discussing Issues

In the questionnaire, teachers were asked to indicate the reason or reasons why they would not discuss an issue in the classroom. Teachers' responses were coded as either a sanction or a nonsanction reason for not discussing an issue. The sanction reasons included: administrative disapproval, community pressure, or parental criticism. The nonsanction reasons included: "lack of class maturity," "personal reasons," and "not pertinent to subject matter."

Sanction Reasons: Are teachers avoiding discussion of social issues because they anticipate, or are afraid of, punitive action? Do teachers feel administrative pressure to avoid certain topics? Do community groups act as watchdogs for society by exerting pressure on teachers to avoid certain issues?

It is not uncommon for researchers and the general public to think of school teachers as an occupational group terribly concerned with sanctioning agents. In his Oregon study, Zeigler indicated that sanctions against certain expressive behaviors by teachers in the classroom are perceived as originating from within the educational system rather than from the community.[3] He also found that within the educational system parents were considered to be the greatest threat.

The respondents in the Oregon study were asked whether or not they would argue in class for or against positions on given issues; for example, "Would you argue in class against the censoring of literature by people who feel it is pornographic?" In contrast, our study did not specify the stance of the teacher in relation to a given issue, but rather asked if the teacher would discuss a topic at all and whether or not he considered certain topics to be surrounded by sanctions. Our questionnaire presented a list of topics and asked the teachers to indicate the topics which they felt should

---

[2]Harmon Zeigler, The Political World of the High School Teacher (Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Education Administration, University of Oregon, 1966), p. 116.

[3]Harmon Zeigler, Ibid., p. 157.

not be discussed in the classroom. A second question asked the teacher to indicate the reason or reasons for not discussing certain topics. The fact that our items were more neutral than Zeigler's may have increased our teachers' willingness to discuss issues and decreased concern for sanctioning agents.

Table I indicates that our teachers also considered parents to be the most salient sanctioning agent with regard to the open discussion of controversial issues. Our findings, in contrast to the Oregon study, which disclosed that most sanctions originated from within the system, did not suggest any significant distinctions between sanctions originating from within the educational system and those from the outside community. The Oregon study also showed that men are more sanction-prone than women, but our analysis did not confirm this claim.

TABLE I

Teacher Response:
Sanction Reasons for Not Discussing an Issue

Issues	N	Administrative Disapproval	Community Groups	Parental Criticism
Federal Aid to Education	459	0%	0%	0%
Race Relations and Integration	461	0%	0%	0%
Marriage and Family Relations	461	1%	1%	2%
LSD & "Pot"	461	0%	1%	1%
Management-labor Relations	461	0%	0%	0%
Communist Ideology	461	1%	0%	1%
Railroad Baron Era	461	0%	0%	0%
Pornography and Its Control	461	4%	3%	7%
Biological Evolution	461	2%	3%	3%
Birth Control	461	5%	6%	10%
Censorship	461	0%	0%	0%
Vietnam	461	0%	0%	0%
Artificial Insemination of Human Beings	462	9%	9%	17%

In two studies, one conducted in Virginia and one conducted in Ohio, teachers appeared to endorse the principle of open discussion of controversial social issues in school, but the same teachers avoided certain topics which were considered taboo in local areas. Those teachers indicated considerable concern for community pressure.[4] Our questionnaire did not specifically ask if certain topics were considered taboo by local communities. However, the general absence of concern expressed for sanctions in discussing issues indicates that most of the teachers in the Michigan sample do not perceive community, administrative, or parental criticism as factors hindering the discussion or examination of "hot" topics.

This contrast in findings might be explained in terms of regional differences between the South and the North. This explanation does not seem warranted, however, since this type of regional explanation would, at the most, account for only the contrast in findings in the Virginia and Michigan studies. Region certainly does not explain the difference in findings between the Michigan and Ohio studies.

A more plausible explanation seems to be the change in the country's mood since the 1953 and 1958 studies. The attention given to social issues by the mass media may well be a reflection of growing public interest in this domain. Teachers who see issues discussed openly in the public media perhaps feel less community or administrative pressure to avoid discussing social issues in the classroom. It might also be possible to explain the relatively low level of concern for sanctions in terms of higher job security and teacher-increasing participation in union activities.

Nonsanction Reasons: We know from the analysis of the data that most teachers are not discussing controversial social issues in their formal instruction in the classroom. If they are not avoiding issues because of fear of sanctioning agents, why are they not talking about some issues? Table II indicates that nonsanction factors actually account for more unwillingness to discuss controversial social issues than sanction factors. Table II indicates that the primary reason cited by most teachers for not discussing the "Railroad Baron Era" is that the topic is considered not pertinent to the subject matter of the course. Table II also shows a high percentage of teachers who say that the reason they do not discuss the sex-related topics is lack of class maturity.

Time Spent Discussing Controversial Issues

How much class time do teachers devote to discussing controversial social issues? Are social issues the main focus of their course, or are they considered incidental to the main purpose of instruction?

---

[4]Calvin Deam, Opinion of Virginia Schoolmen Concerning the Treatment of Controversial Issues (Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, Indiana University, 1958), and Truman L. Hall, A Study of the Teaching of Controversial Issues in the Secondary Schools of Ohio (Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1953).

TABLE II

Teacher Response:
Nonsanction Reasons for Not Discussing an Issue

Issues	N	Percent of teachers who gave nonsanction reasons for not discussing listed issues: Lack of Class Maturity	Personal Reasons	Not pertinent to subject matter
Federal Aid to Education	459	0%	0%	4%
Race Relations and Integration	461	1%	0%	1%
Marriage and Family Relations	461	4%	1%	4%
LSD and "Pot"	461	2%	0%	1%
Management-labor Relations	461	1%	0%	6%
Communist Ideology	461	1%	0%	3%
Railroad Baron Era	461	1%	0%	12%
Pornography and Its Control	461	14%	2%	9%
Biological Evolution	461	4%	1%	11%
Birth Control	461	15%	3%	13%
Censorship	461	0%	0%	1%
Vietnam	461	0%	0%	1%
Artificial Insemination of Human Beings	462	28%	7%	26%

In the opinion of the teachers, do social issues constitute a legitimate way to spend class time?

It is important to keep in mind the limitations of possible qualitative inferences associated with amount of time spent discussing controversial social issues. Certainly time spent discussing issues is not the only consideration--quality of student-teacher interaction and

intensity of treatment are also very important, but time does provide an index that gives us an idea of how central the teacher thinks social issues are to his goals of instruction.

The majority of the teachers generally do not spend a large portion of their class time discussing controversial issues. Table III indicates that 87 percent of the sample spend less than 25 percent of their teaching time discussing issues. Only three teachers in our sample apparently consider the examination of controversial social issues to be the main content of their courses.

TABLE III

Teacher Response:
Time Spent Discussing Controversial Social Issues

Percent of teaching time spent discussing social issues	N	Percent of teachers
0 - 10%	256	52.3%
10 - 25%	170	34.7%
25 - 50%	43	8.8%
50 - 75%	13	2.7%
75 - 100%	3	.6%
no response	4	.9%

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF SOCIAL ISSUES TEACHERS

Is a "social issues" teacher different from teachers who avoid discussing controversy in the classroom? If we knew the sex or number of years teaching of an individual, would we be able to say anything about the probability of that teacher discussing controversial social issues? The analysis of several items included on the questionnaire gives us an idea of the demographic profile of the "social issues" teacher.

Subject Area

Of the categories of teachers included in our sample, social studies teachers spend the most time teaching about social issues. Perhaps this is to be expected due to the nature of their subject. It is possible that social issues are considered to be "current events," and consequently are included in the curriculum more often by social studies teachers. Some type of self-selection may also account for more social issues discussion by social studies teachers. Social studies may well attract people who are more willing to discuss social

problems. When we divide the sample into the subject fields of biology, English, and social studies, we find that 6 percent of the biology teachers, 8 percent of the English teachers, and 16 percent of the social studies teachers spend more than 25 percent of their class time discussing issues. These findings suggest that (a) a majority of the teachers in our sample do not consider social issues the central focus of the learning process and (b) proportionately, more social studies teachers discuss issues than either biology or English teachers.

Number of Years Teaching

Are the least experienced teachers the more likely persons to introduce social issues into the classroom? Are more experienced teachers avoiding the discussion of controversy in the classroom?

The data in Table IV indicate that teachers with four to five years of teaching experience are the most willing to discuss all issues. One might speculate that beginning teachers, who would be especially concerned with maintaining classroom discipline and who lack job security, might avoid discussing controversial issues in the classroom. On the other hand, teachers with many years of teaching experience may not be as willing to discuss issues as younger teachers because they had their training before the classroom discussion of social issues was considered relevant or legitimate. It is difficult to offer a single explanation for the drop after the fifth year of teaching; at this point, possibly some of the teachers interested in issue discussion either leave teaching or move into administrative jobs.

TABLE IV

Willingness and Unwillingness to Discuss Social Issues
(By Number of Years Teaching)

	Total Sample	0-1	2-3	4-5	6-10	11-20	21-30	Over 30
Percent of teachers who would discuss all listed issues in the classroom	42%	26%	46%	54%	42%	45%	28%	36%
Percent of teachers who would not discuss one or more listed issues in the classroom	58%	64%	54%	46%	58%	55%	72%	64%
N =	485	90	105	48	85	83	46	28

When we look at the issues which teachers would not discuss for either sanction or nonsanction reasons by number of years teaching, it is clear that even the most experienced teachers are willing to discuss some

issues considered highly controversial (see Table V). Communist ideology, a topic the teachers indicated as highly controversial, is nevertheless considered an acceptable topic by 100 percent of the teachers with over twenty years of teaching and by 93 percent of the teachers with more than ten years in the profession. "Race relations and integration," another highly controversial topic, is also considered acceptable for classroom discussion by 96 percent of teachers with over ten years of teaching experience. It appears that the current popularity of the race issue has convinced even the most reticent classroom teachers of its validity as subject matter. Table V tends to weaken somewhat the idea of a teacher automatically accepting a more conservative attitude toward social issues solely in terms of years on the job.

TABLE V

Unwillingness to Discuss Specific Social Issues
(By Number of Years Teaching)

Percent of teachers who would not discuss the listed issues in the classroom

Issues	Total	Number of years teaching: 0-1	2-3	4-5	6-10	11-20	21-30	Over 30
Federal Aid to Education	5%	11%	5%	8%	2%	4%	0%	7%
Race Relations and Integration	2%	3%	1%	0%	2%	0%	4%	4%
Marriage and Family Relations	7%	9%	5%	2%	7%	8%	7%	21%
LSD & "Pot"	4%	2%	2%	4%	4%	2%	7%	11%
Management-labor Relations	7%	7%	5%	8%	7%	6%	4%	18%
Communist Ideology	5%	2%	3%	2%	9%	7%	0%	14%
Railroad Baron Era	14%	11%	10%	15%	13%	13%	26%	21%
Pornography and Its Control	20%	27%	19%	13%	24%	17%	15%	18%
Biological Evolution	15%	19%	13%	10%	13%	13%	22%	18%
Birth Control	28%	30%	25%	25%	22%	33%	35%	25%
Censorship	2%	1%	3%	0%	2%	1%	0%	7%
Vietnam	2%	0%	1%	0%	2%	4%	0%	11%
Artificial Insemination of Human Beings	47%	52%	43%	35%	46%	45%	67%	43%
N =	485	90	105	48	85	83	46	28

When reading Table V, it should be kept in mind that this table included both sanction and nonsanction reasons for not discussing a given topic. Consequently although 26 percent of the teachers with more than twenty years of teaching experience indicate they would not discuss the "Railroad Baron Era," it is not necessarily for the same reason that teachers do not want to talk about "artificial insemination of human beings."

Sex of Teacher

Sex of teacher is often considered an important explanatory variable in a teacher's willingness to discuss social issues. Table VI indicates that significantly more male than female teachers would discuss all issues in the classroom.

TABLE VI

Willingness and Unwillingness to Discuss Social Issues
(By Sex of Teacher)

	Total Sample	Sex of Teacher	
		Male	Female
Percent of teachers who *would* discuss all listed issues in the classroom	41%	49%	33%
Percent of teachers who *would not* discuss one or more listed issues in the classroom	59%	51%	67%
N =	488	262	226

Chi Square: 10.36 (.01 level of significance)

Previous findings indicate that male teachers are more expressive in the classroom than female teachers.[5] Our data substantiate this relationship. Table VII indicates that males are much more willing to discuss sex-related topics, such as "pornography and its control," "birth control," and "artificial insemination of human beings," than females. The willingness on the part of males to discuss the sex-related issues may also account for the higher total percentage of males willing to discuss all issues. The finding that females are generally less willing than males to discuss the sex-related topics might well be an example of the residual effects of Victorian teachings about sex. Another possible explanation might be that males, because of their greater sense of political efficacy, spend more class time than females examining social issues.

---

[5]Harmon Zeigler, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

TABLE VII

Issues Which Should Not be Discussed
(By Sex of Teacher)

Issues	Total Sample	Sex of Teacher: Male	Sex of Teacher: Female
	Percent of teachers who feel they should not discuss the listed topics		
Federal Aid to Education	5%	4%	7%
Race Relations and Integration	2%	2%	2%
Marriage and Family Relations	7%	8%	7%
LSD & "Pot"	3%	3%	4%
Communist Ideology	5%	5%	5%
Management-labor Relations	7%	5%	9%
Railroad Baron Era	14%	10%	18%
Pornography and Its Control	20%	19%	21%
Biological Evolution	15%	12%	19%
Birth Control	28%	23%	33%
Censorship	2%	2%	1%
Vietnam	2%	2%	2%
Artificial Insemination of Human Beings	47%	39%	57%
N =	489	262	226

BELIEF IN STUDENT EXPRESSION AND BELIEF IN TEACHER EXPRESSION

One of the most important questions our study considered was whether or not teachers believe in teacher expressive behavior in the classroom with regard to the discussion of social issues. Do teachers have a clear conception of what their position in the classroom should be vis-a-vis social issues? Should the teacher feel free to express his opinions on any given issue? This involves the larger question of the teacher's self image.

A second important concern was how teachers view the student's role in the examination of social controversy. Do teachers allow or

encourage student expressive behavior within the classroom? Both of these areas were considered important in gaining a comprehensive picture of the classroom.

Development of Scales: Belief in Student Expression and Belief in Teacher Expression

The questionnaire included a number of attitudinal items, and each teacher was asked to respond to these items with "strongly agree," "somewhat agree," "somewhat disagree," or "strongly disagree." A factor analysis using varimax rotation was performed on teachers' responses to the attitudinal items. Of the three factors which emerged from this analysis, one appeared to measure belief in teacher expression in the classroom and the other, belief in student expression in the classroom. The attitudinal items which loaded heavily on these two factors are as follows:

A. Factor One (Belief in Teacher Expression)

Questionnaire Items	Loading
(1) Reveal own opinions supported by reasons before unit of study is finished.	Positive
(2) Keep own opinions hidden under any and all circumstances.	Negative
(3) The teacher should remain neutral to be objective.	Negative
(4) The teacher can take a position and be objective too.	Positive

B. Factor Two (Belief in Student Expression)

Questionnaire Items	Loading
(1) All ideas should be publicly defended.	Positive
(2) Reasons for opinions should be discussed openly.	Positive
(3) I feel that students should participate in class discussion every day.	Positive
(4) Students should be encouraged to voice their opinions on all subjects.	Positive

FIGURE I

A positive teacher response to the questionnaire statement "Reveal own opinions supported by reasons before unit of study is finished" indicates that the teacher considers the classroom a legitimate forum for the expression of grounded personal opinions. The teacher with a negative response to the item, "Keep own opinions hidden under any and all circumstances," again seems to reflect a stance in favor of teacher classroom expression. The belief that a teacher can be objective without being silent concerning controversial issues also reinforces the concept of the classroom as a place for the expression of ideas. A logical examination of the items loading heavily on this factor suggests we measured the teacher's position regarding belief in teacher expression in the classroom.

Responses to the second set of items indicate the degree to which a teacher feels that students should play a strong participatory role in the discussion of controversial topics. Teachers who respond positively to these items seem to believe strongly that students should be actively involved in classroom discussion of issues.

The items in Factor One (Figure I) were used to construct a scale called "Belief in Teacher Expression" (BTE), while the items listed under Factor Two (Figure I) were used to construct a scale titled, "Belief in Student Expression" (BSE).

A teacher's score on Factor One was calculated as follows:

$$\text{Score} = {}^{p}\Sigma_{1}\,(4(SA) + 3(A) + 2(D) + (SD)) + {}^{n}\Sigma_{1}\,(4(SD) + 3(D) + 2(A) + (SA))$$

A teacher's score on Factor Two was calculated as follows:

$$\text{Score} = {}^{p}\Sigma_{1}\,(4(SA) + 3(A) + 2(D) + (SD))$$

where p = the items which load positively on the factor, n = the items which load negatively on the factor, SA = a response of strongly agree with the statement, A = a response of somewhat agree, D = a response of somewhat disagree, and SD = a response of strongly disagree.

For the "Belief in Teacher Expression," scale (BTE), a range of scores 4-16 was possible; this range was collapsed into a scale from 1-9. The higher a teacher's score, the greater his belief in teacher expression.

For the "Belief in Student Expression" scale (BSE), a range of scores 4-16 was possible; this range was collapsed into a scale from 1-9. The higher a teacher's score, the greater his belief in student expression.

For each of the scales, the teachers in the sample were divided into three groups--those falling in the low one-third of each scale were identified as the low group (i.e. those having belief in student or teacher expression), those in the middle one-third were the medium group, and those in the upper one-third were the high group.

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF TEACHERS WITH EXPRESSIVE ORIENTATIONS

The study was concerned with a range of demographic variables as they relate to high or low BSE or BTE teachers. Demographic items included number of years teaching, subject area, undergraduate major, college attended, sex, and type of community.

Type of Community

Researchers have suggested that type of community does have an important relationship to both student and teacher classroom expression. This is the kind of relationship we wanted to explore further in our study.

Our data indicate that there is no significant relationship (at the .05 level) between community size and BSE groups or between community size and BTE groups. This finding is in contrast to an earlier report by Jennings and Zeigler, which found that community size was related to teacher expression.[6] Our finding of no significant differences in either BSE or BTE groups on the basis of community size contrasts sharply with relevant research conducted in the past which indicated less expressive behavior on the part of rural or small-town populations than that of urban dwellers.[7]

Number of Years Teaching

The findings for the total sample of teachers indicate that the teachers with more than five years of teaching were less committed to discussion of social issues than younger teachers, with the high peak of commitment occurring in the 4-5 year range. On the basis of this finding, one might speculate that teachers with a high belief in student and teacher expression would have taught five years or less. It might also be expected that low BSE teachers and low BTE teachers would be the more experienced teachers.

The findings on number of years teaching by BSE and BTE groupings were not consistent. An analysis of variance for BSE groups by number of years teaching produced an F-Ratio* of 4.12, significant at

---

[6]M. Kent Jennings and Harmon Zeigler, "Political Expressivism Among High School Teachers: The Intersection of Community and Occupational Values" (Paper to appear as chapter in a book on political socialization to be edited by Roberta S. Sigel and published by Random House), p. 9.

[7]Elmo Roper (New York: 30 Rockefeller Plaza, Unpublished tabulations in files).

*F-Ratio calculated for all three groups (this pattern appears throughout the remainder of paper).

.05 level and a t-Ratio** of 2.73, significant at .01 level. This means that the more years a teacher has been teaching the less likely he is to have a high BSE score. This finding is compatible with our hypothesis that the majority of the more experienced teachers would fall into the low BSE group. However, analysis of BTE groups by number of years teaching does not indicate any significant differences, with an F-Ratio of 1.27 and a t-Ratio of -1.38. Why belief in high student expression should decrease with number of years teaching without a corresponding influence on belief in teacher expression is puzzling. Possibly this finding is a reflection of disillusionment on the part of more experienced teachers who no longer believe in the ability of students to contribute constructively to class discussion. With further analysis, we might find the more experienced teachers are also the older teachers. If so, the consequent differences in belief in student expression might be explained by the type of training these teachers received in college.

Area of Primary Interest

The analysis for the total sample indicates that social studies teachers were the most committed to social issues discussions. Table VIII indicates that area of primary interest is also related to BSE groups. When teachers are grouped by area of primary interest, we find that social studies teachers tend to have a much higher belief in student expression than biology or English teachers. This finding might be explained as follows: Perhaps social studies teachers feel students should participate more in class because they feel social problems can be examined fruitfully only in an open dialogue classroom. Possibly course content and teaching materials in the social studies provide more opportunities for open examination of social controversy. Since, according to our findings, social studies teachers are more committed to the discussion of social controversy, it may not be too surprising that of the types of teachers investigated, social studies teachers are the most in favor of student expression. However, area of primary interest did not have a significant relationship to BTE groupings.

TABLE VIII

Belief in Student Expression
(By Area of Primary Interest)

Teacher stated area of primary interest	N	Percent of Teachers in Each Group — Belief in Student Expression Groups: Low	Medium	High	
Biology	59	27%	34%	39%	100%
English	158	34%	30%	36%	100%
Social Studies	151	17%	38%	44%	100%
N =	368	96	125	147	

Chi Square = 14.81 (.01 level of significance)

**t-Ratio calculated for low and high groups.

Other Demographic Variables

Other demographic variables investigated--such as sex of teacher, whether or not a teacher lived in the community in which he taught, undergraduate major, and size of college from which the teacher graduated--were not significant for either BSE groups or BTE groups. Our data indicate that neither level of education (whether or not advanced study was undertaken) nor college attended had any significant influence on BSE or BTE groupings. The results for tenure status were mixed with no significant differences for BSE groups, but significance at the .01 level, for BTE groups. Possibly teachers do not feel threatened or accountable for opinions expressed by students in the classroom, but feel personally more expressive when they have job security in a tenured position.

DISCUSSION OF SOCIAL ISSUES BY EXPRESSIVE TEACHERS

Several hypotheses of the study were concerned with amount of classroom time given to issues, type of issues discussed, etc. Do teachers with a high belief in student expression spend more time discussing social issues? Does belief in student or teacher expression make a difference in the number of issues considered acceptable for class discussion? These and similar questions were the focus of this part of the analysis.

Time Spent Discussing Social Issues

Time spent discussing controversial social issues is not significant for BTE groups (chi square 3.93). It appears that high BTE teachers do not necessarily spend any more class time discussing social issues than low BTE teachers.

Table IX makes it clear that high BSE teachers do devote more class time to issue discussion when compared to low BSE teachers.

TABLE IX

Belief in Student Expression
By Time Spent Discussing Controversial Social Issues

Percent of teaching time spent discussing controversial social issues	N	Percent of Teachers in Each Group — Belief in Student Expression Groups: Low	Medium	High
0 - 10%	245	63%	51%	46%
10 - 25%	165	28%	37%	39%
25 - 100%	58	09%	12%	15%
N =	468	123	164	181

Chi Square = 9.49 (.05 level of significance)

t-Test Between Low and High Groups = 3.67 (.01 level of significance)

Fifteen percent of high BSE teachers discuss controversial issues more than 25 percent of class time. This finding compares with about 12 percent for the total sample of teachers who spent more than 25 percent of class time discussing controversial issues. Possibly high BSE teachers want to maximize student participation and involvement and feel social issues discussion will accomplish this goal.

Willingness to Discuss All Issues

One might assume that teachers who have a high belief in student expression might also be more willing to discuss all of the social issues than low BSE teachers. Table X indicates that this hypothesis is substantiated by the data. The high BSE teachers are significantly more willing to discuss all issues than the low BSE teachers. Thirty-one percent of the low BSE teachers are willing to discuss all issues; this finding compares with 42 percent of the total sample of teachers who were willing to discuss all issues. There is no significant differences between the high BTE teachers and low BTE teachers in their willingness to discuss all issues.

TABLE X

Belief in Student Expression and
Belief in Teacher Expression
By Willingness to Discuss All Social Issues

	Belief in Student Expression Groups				
	Low	Medium	High	Chi	T-Test Between Low and High Groups
Percent of teachers in each group who would discuss all listed issues in the classroom	31%	48%	45%	9.15**	2.45*
	Belief in Teacher Expression Groups				
	Low	Medium	High	Chi	T-Test Between Low and High Groups
	38%	41%	47%	2.74	1.58

* .02 level of significance
** .01 level of significance

Issues Which Should Not Be Discussed

It could be hypothesized that a higher percentage of high BSE teachers would not only be more willing to talk about all topics, but would consider fewer topics forbidden in the classroom. As you may recall in our analysis for the total sample of teachers, the highly

controversial, sex-related topics were avoided by many teachers, especially females.

Table XI indicates that high BSE teachers are significantly more willing than low BSE teachers to discuss the sex-related topics, "marriage and family relations," "pornography and its control," "birth control," and "artificial insemination of human beings." This finding supports our hypothesis that high BSE teachers are more willing to discuss the "hottest" issues. In the case of artificial insemination of human beings, 46 percent of the high BSE teachers still feel they should not discuss this issue; however, if we eliminate this issue from consideration, over 82 percent of the high BSE teachers will discuss all of the other issues. It is possible that teachers feel more hesitant to discuss "artificial insemination of human beings" because they feel less qualified to deal with this topic than with the others. Other reasons might be lack of personal preparation for discussion of the topic and/or failure to see its relevance to their subject field.

TABLE XI

Belief in Student Expression
By Issues Which Should Not Be Discussed

Percent of teachers in each group who feel they should not discuss a given issue

Issues	BSE GROUPS Low	Medium	High	Total N	Chi
Federal Aid to Education	05%	04%	07%	459	1.63
Race Relations and Integration	03%	01%	01%	461	3.72
Marriage and Family Relations	17%	03%	04%	461	22.33**
LSD and "Pot"	02%	03%	04%	461	.50
Management-labor Relations	11%	06%	07%	461	3.03
Communist Ideology	07%	05%	04%	461	1.89
Railroad Baron Era	19%	12%	12%	461	3.44
Pornography and Its Control	31%	15%	18%	461	12.01*
Biological Evolution	16%	17%	13%	461	.91
Birth Control	39%	25%	24%	461	9.26*
Censorship	01%	01%	03%	461	2.02
Vietnam	01%	03%	02%	461	1.91
Artificial Insemination of Human Beings	61%	40%	46%	462	12.52*

* .01 level of significance
** .001 level of significance

Table XII indicates the issues which should not be discussed by BTE Groups. There is a significant difference for only the biological evolution issue. Apparently low BTE teachers are as willing to express their positions on issues as high BTE teachers.

Again, this finding is consistent with our previous tables where high belief in student expression appears to be much more related to other variables than high belief in teacher expression.

TABLE XII

Belief in Teacher Expression
By Issues Which Should Not Be Discussed

Issues	Low	Medium	High	Total N	Chi
Federal Aid to Education	03%	07%	05%	459	1.43
Race Relations and Integration	02%	02%	01%	461	2.22
Marriage and Family Relations	10%	08%	05%	461	3.22
LSD and "Pot"	03%	03%	03%	461	0.01
Management-labor Relations	08%	06%	08%	461	.72
Communist Ideology	07%	06%	04%	461	1.54
Railroad Baron Era	14%	13%	15%	461	.56
Pornography and Its Control	25%	20%	17%	461	2.97
Biological Evolution	08%	22%	14%	461	10.44*
Birth Control	32%	29%	25%	461	1.85
Censorship	01%	03%	01%	461	3.23
Vietnam	02%	01%	03%	461	.85
Artificial Insemination of Human Beings	53%	49%	44%	462	2.81

* .01 level of significance

Type of Materials Ordinarily Used When Teaching Controversial Social Issues

Another concern of this study was type and quality of materials used by a teacher in class discussions of controversial issues. Our hypothesis was that the selection of materials will reflect a teacher's commitment to in-depth issue discussion. More specifically, we hypothesized that both high BSE and high BTE teachers would (a) not rely

on a single textbook as the only source of authority, (b) use a wider variety of materials than low BSE and low BTE teachers, and (c) be more willing than the low BSE and low BTE teachers to use the materials which reflect extreme positions on an issue.

Table XIII indicates that belief in student expression is related to the types of materials used when in the discussion of controversial issues. High BSE teachers use more types of materials than low BSE teachers. When discussing population planning, high BSE teachers are significantly more willing to use four of the eleven sources of materials than low BSE teachers. Materials which are somewhat polemical or from controversial sources such as, papers critical of the over-emphasis on population control, books and pamphlets published in foreign countries regarding family planning, are used significantly more frequently by high BSE teachers than by low BSE teachers.

The findings for materials ordinarily used when teaching about communism are even more interesting. High BSE teachers are apparently much more convinced of the validity of utilizing original communist sources and Soviet books and pamphlets when discussing communism than low BSE teachers. It also appears that high BSE teachers are more willing than low BSE teachers to use non-USA materials in the study of communism. A previous study found that school board members and superintendents agreed that such topics as, the free enterprise system, democracy, and communism should be treated objectively; but, at the same time, they felt that the teachers should convey an understanding of the "superiority of the American way of life in all things" when these topics were studied.[8]

Of course without visiting the actual classrooms, it is impossible to determine if the materials are being used in a reflective manner, but even the willingness to have students use a wider variety of materials indicates some movement away from strict indoctrination.

There were no significant differences in the use of materials by BTE groups. The data indicate that there is no relationship between a teacher's belief in expression and his choice of classroom materials for discussing controversy. Apparently high or low belief in teacher expression is not a significant factor in the choice of classroom materials.

---

[8]Neal Gross, Who Runs Our Schools (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), p. 195.

TABLE XIII

Belief in Student Expression Groups
By Types of Materials Used in the Classroom

MATERIALS ORDINARILY USED	Percent of teachers in each group who ordinarily use a given type of material				
	BSE GROUPS			Total	
A. Population Planning	Low	Medium	High	N	Chi
Studies analyzing the population explosion, family planning, and birth control	68%	80%	86%	462	14.92***
Books and pamphlets published in foreign countries regarding national family planning	39%	46%	56%	462	8.51****
Material produced by independent non-profit organizations such as Planned Parenthood	72%	72%	77%	462	1.37
Standard texts	65%	68%	70%	462	.80
Material produced by pressure groups such as the Population Crisis Committee	30%	35%	39%	462	2.87
Material prepared by religious organizations such as the Catholic Church	45%	49%	57%	462	4.99
Reprints from popular magazines such as TIME	63%	72%	77%	462	7.53*
Reprints from Congressional hearings such as those held by Senator Gruening's Committee	41%	47%	43%	462	1.37
Material produced by government agencies such as The Children's Bureau and Bureau of Family Services in H.E.W.	69%	63%	66%	462	.94
Papers critical of the over-emphasis on population control	31%	45%	50%	462	10.68**
Material written by distinguished population scholars	58%	64%	71%	462	5.33

TABLE XIII continued-

MATERIALS ORDINARILY USED	Percent of teachers in each group who ordinarily use a given type of material				
	BSE GROUPS			Total	
B. Communism	Low	Medium	High	N	Chi
Standard textbooks	81%	80%	79%	463	.21
Original Communist sources (e.g., the Communist Manifesto.)	68%	77%	82%	464	7.76*
Books and pamphlets published in the Soviet Union	44%	44%	60%	464	11.44**
Material produced by such organizations as the American Legion	36%	43%	47%	464	3.74
Material prepared by such organizations as the John Birch Society	33%	37%	44%	464	3.95
Material produced by the American Communist Party	38%	41%	50%	463	5.28
Material written by distinguished American scholars	86%	86%	91%	464	2.70
Material written by distinguished Soviet scholars	78%	80%	86%	464	3.81
Material developed by professional educational associations	61%	66%	75%	464	6.95*

* .05 level of significance
** .01 level of significance
*** .001 level of significance
**** .02 level of significance

SUMMARY

The image of the sanction-prone teacher afraid of discussing controversial issues has been brought into serious question by our data. Eighty percent or more of the teachers in our sample are willing to discuss 10 of the 13 issues presented. When teachers do avoid controversial issues, they indicate that they do so because of considerations such as pertinency to subject matter, maturity of the class, or personal factors rather than fear of administrative or community disapproval. Of course, it is possible that teachers actually are concerned about community, administrative and parental pressure, but feel that answering the questions in terms of pertinency to subject matter, and the like, is more intellectually defensible. An equally plausible explanation is that community and administrative norms have changed regarding social issues. Possibly the teachers' seeming lack of concern for sanctioning agents reflects a growing feeling on the part of administrators and the concerned public that social issues constitute a legitimate domain of educators and should be discussed openly in the classroom.

A single demographic profile of the social issues teacher does not emerge from the data. More years of teaching diminishes a teacher's willingness to discuss social issues, but new teachers are also unwilling to discuss some issues. Possibly, if beginning teachers were better prepared in the skills required for successful inquiry into value issues, they would discuss more issues in their classrooms.

The type and variety of materials used by high BSE teachers suggest that belief in student expression might be a desirable attitude to develop in teachers. If so, the question is how can high belief in student expression be fostered. Our data certainly do not provide any easy answers. Teachers in the social studies field appear to have the highest belief in student expression, but why? Perhaps a "type of person" who has high belief in student expression is attracted to social studies, rather than something inherent in the social studies promoting high belief in student expression. More investigation is needed to sort out these relationships.

Teachers' diminishing concern with sanctioning agents and the general public's increasing concern with social issues may create the conditions which allow the school into the area of value examination. If so, college educators, particularly, have growing responsibility to provide the training teachers will need to have for meaningful instruction in social issues and value controversies.